



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,955	10/29/2003	Dae Sung Seo	1751-344	6164
6449	7590	03/17/2005	EXAMINER	
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.			PAREKH, NITIN	
1425 K STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	
SUITE 800			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2811	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,955

Applicant(s)

SEO, DAE SUNG

Examiner

Nitin Parekh

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (APA) in view of Fukaya (US Pat. 5969411).

Regarding claims 1 and 8-10, the APA discloses micro lead frame (MLF) package/MLFP (see 10 in Fig. 1-3) comprising:

- a semiconductor die/chip (not numerically referenced in Fig. 1-3) within the MLFP
- the MLF having an upper/top and lower/bottom surfaces and a die pad (16 in Fig. 3), leads formed along the outer sides of the die pad (14 in Fig. 3), and tie bars (not numerically referenced- see Fig. 3) for supporting four corners of the die pad
- an epoxy molding compound (EMC 12 in Fig. 1-3) for encapsulating the semiconductor chip, the MLF and the wires, and
- the die pad, the leads, and the tie bars being coplanar after being encapsulated by the EMC and are exposed outward

(APA: Fig. 1-3; specification pages 1 and 2).

Art Unit: 2811

The APA fails to teach:

- the semiconductor die/chip being mounted via adhesive means and having wires being connected with the leads of the MLF, and
- the die pad, the leads, and the tie bars having an oblique etching portion.

Fukaya teaches a LFP where a chip (38 in Fig. 5) is adhesively mounted on a die pad (see Fig. 5; Col. 4, line 66) and is connected with respective leads of the LFP via bonding wires (see 40A/40B in Fig. 5). Fukaya further teaches the die pad and the leads having an oblique/curved etching profile/portion (see Ra/Rb and 36A/36B/32 in Fig. 5) to improve the lead cutting (Col. 3, line 65- Col. 5, line 63; Col. 7), the LFP structure further having the die pad leads and tie bars (Fig. 14; Col. 7, lines 22-32). Such etching profile/portion has a dimension/size of the oblique etching portion in a bottom surface of the leads being greater than that of an upper surface (see Fig. 5).

Furthermore, parameters such as length/width and thickness of leads, shape/profile of a cross-section of die pad/leads/tie bars and respective dimensions, number of leads, diameter of through-holes in a substrate, number of through-holes, spacing/pitch, and a range of such dimensions in chip/LFP packaging and encapsulation technology art is a subject of routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the desired package dimension, weight, bonding strength, reduced level of mechanical/thermal stress and improved reliability and performance.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the semiconductor chip being mounted via adhesive

Art Unit: 2811

means, the chip having the wires connecting respective leads; the die pad and the leads/tie bars having an oblique etching portion and to select the size of the oblique etching portion in the bottom surface of the MLF being greater than that of the upper surface by about 1-10% as taught by Fukaya so that lead deformation can be prevented, and the lead cutting can be improved in the APA.

Regarding claim 1, forming the upper/lower surfaces of the MLF/leads do not distinguish over the APA and Fukaya, because only the final product/structure is relevant, not the process of forming the upper/lower surfaces of the MLF/leads such as "etching using a solution", "drilling", "water jet etching" or "stamping". Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and *In re Marrosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. See also MPEP 706.03(e).

3. Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the APA and Fukaya (US Pat. 5969411) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brown (US Pat. 4918511) and Masuda et al. (US Pat. 4862246).

Regarding claims 2-5, APA and Fukaya teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 1 above, except a dimple/plurality of dimples being formed on the die pad, leads or tie bars for increasing the attachment strength between the MLFP and the EMC.

Brown teaches a LFP having a die paddle/pad (see 10 in Fig. 2-4) where the die paddle/pad has a plurality of grooves being formed on a top or bottom surface of the die paddle/pad including those along edges and four corners to reduce mechanical stress in the LFP, the grooves being in a form of dimples or slits (see 40b and 40 in Fig. 4 and Fig. 2/3 respectively; Fig. Col. 1, line 50- Col. 3, line 16).

Masuda et al. teach a LFP having a plurality of depressions/dimples in a die tab/pad, leads and tie bars (see 11 in 13, 10 and 14 respectively in Fig. 3B) to improve resin adhesion and mechanical strength in the LFP (Fig. 1-3B; Col. 2, line 44- Col. 4, line 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the dimple being formed on the die pad, leads or tie bars for increasing the attachment strength between the MLFP and the EMC as taught

by Brown so that adhesion and bonding strength among the LFP, EMC and the chip can be improved and the stress can be relieved in the Fukaya and APA's MLFP.

4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the APA and Fukaya (US Pat. 5969411) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Murata (US Pat. 6483184).

Regarding claim 6 and 7, APA and Fukaya teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 1 above, except the MLFP having holes for firm solder connection at the tips of the leads, the holes having a diameter ranging from 50% to 95% of the width of the leads.

Murata teaches a resin sealed wire bonded package (Fig. 1A/1B) having a metal frame/leads being extended to peripheral sides of the package such that the leads (see 20, 22, etc. in Fig. 1B) have semicircular shape holes at the tips (see 30 in Fig. 1A/1B) where the holes are provided with solder to provide firm solder connection at the tips of the leads (Col. 5, lines 45-62; Col. 4, line 60- Col. 7, line 19; Col. 2-7). Such holes have dimension/diameters being less than width of the leads (see Fig. 1B; Col. 3, line 5).

Furthermore, parameters such as length/width and thickness of leads, number of leads, diameter of through-holes in a substrate, number of through-holes, spacing/pitch, and a range of such dimensions in chip/LFP packaging and encapsulation technology art is a subject of routine experimentation and optimization to achieve the desired

package dimension, weight, bonding strength, reduced level of mechanical/thermal stress and improved reliability and performance.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the MLFP having holes for firm solder connection at the tips of the leads and select the holes having a diameter ranging from 50% to 95% of the width of the leads as taught by Murata so that the adhesion and bonding strength for an external connection can be improved and the stress can be relieved in the Fukaya and APA's MLFP.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 12-23-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant contends that Fukaya does not teach the claimed method of etching and using the etching solution.

However, as explained above, the claims 1-10 are directed to a structure of MLF and not the method of making such structure.

B. Applicant contends that there is no motivation to combine Fukaya with the APA.

However, as explained above, Fukaya clearly teaches the die pad and the leads having an oblique/curved etching profile/portion (see Ra/Rb and 36A/36B/32 in Fig. 3-5) to facilitate cutting by having the thinned portion at the cut position (see Col. 4, lines 44-



50) and to provide the lead cutting without causing any damage to the bonding wires (Col. 5, lines 43-50, Col. 3-5).

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Parekh whose telephone number is 571-272-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on 09:00AM-05:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on 571-272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9318.

Art Unit: 2811

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

NP

03-11-05



NITIN PAREKH

PATENT EXAMINER

Technology Center 2800